UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/532,755	03/22/2000	Craig A. Finseth	PD-990193	8261
	7590 04/01/200 7 GROUP, INC.	EXAMINER		
PATENT DOC	KET ADMINISTRAT	SHELEHEDA, JAMES R		
CA / LA1 / A10 P O BOX 956	<i>1</i> 9	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
EL SEGUNDO	, CA 90245-0956	2623		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/532,755	FINSETH ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JAMES SHELEHEDA	2623		

	JAMES SHELEHEDA	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addi	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the size forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a considered after a final rejection and a considere	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); er form for appeal by materially re	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (F	
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER The request for reconsideration has been considered but 		•	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).		r derivation for allowant	o boodago.
13. Other:			
/Chris Kelley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On page 14, applicant argues that while Zigmond may ensure that a certain frequency of display is not exceeded, he fails to disclose displaying advertisements at a certain frequency.

In response, it is noted that the claims merely require that the advertisement to be repeated at "a frequency". Zigmond clearly discloses wherein advertisements are repeatedly shown to the viewers. As the claims do not require any specific frequency of repetition, Zigmond clearly meets the limitation. Indicating that advertisements are repeatedly displayed clearly constitutes a description of displaying advertisements at some frequency.

In response to applicant's arguments on page 15, it is noted that the claims merely require displaying an advertisement at a frequency "based" on a similarity score. In the combination of Zigmond and Knee, as advertisements are selected for display "based" upon their similarity score, they clearly meet the current claim limitations. More specifically, Zigmond discloses wherein selected ads are repeated at some frequency. Knee discloses wherein advertisements are selected based upon their similarity score. Therefore, the combination of Zigmond and Knee disclose wherein displaying an advertisement at a frequency based on a similarity score. Therefore, applicant's arguments are not convincing.

Furthermore, applicant's arguments that this would contrast with the teachings of Zigmond are incorrect. Zigmond merely disclosing having an upper limit on the number of times any particular advertisement is repeated (column 13, lines 40-47). Merely having an upper limit on the total number of repetitions does not teach away from having advertisements which are repeated at a frequency. As Zigmond selects ads based upon the user profile, a poorly matching ad would clearly be selected for display less often than a highly matching ad.